



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/783,841

02/20/2004

Gail E. McGiffin

10022/444

7513

28164 7590 05/13/2008
ACCENTURE CHICAGO 28164
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P O BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

SWARTZ, JAMIE H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3694

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/13/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/783,841 | Applicant(s) MCGIFFIN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner JAMIE H. SWARTZ | Art Unit 3694 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 21-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 21-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/22/2008, 2/12/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on March 7, 2008. Claims 1-10 and 21, 23-24 are currently amended. Claim 25 has been added. Claims 1-10 and 21-25 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 and 21-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 8, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Regarding claims 8, 21-23, the phrase "business line" renders the claim(s) indefinite because it is unclear to one of ordinary skill in the art what the applicant defines as a business line. In claim 23, applicant states "wherein the former participant of the second account has the second business line." Based on claim 6, a participant is

a customer. It is unclear how a past customer of an account has a business line. The use of business line in claim 23 makes the prior uses of business line unclear.

Specification

5. The amendment filed March 7, 2008 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: Claims 1 and 6 teach assigning at least one of a plurality of participants of the first account also assigned to a second account. This feature is new. Neither the previous claims nor the specification teach having someone assigned to the first account and then assigned to a second account. This is new matter.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-10, 21-22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hele et al. (US 20020111835 A1) in view of University of Arizona (2001) in further view of Heise et al. (US 20030074229 A1).

8. Regarding claim 1, Hele teaches managing an underwriting account for an insurance policy (§ 5). Hele teaches establishing participants wherein a customer assigned to an account represents a participant (§ 19-20, 25, 27, 43). Hele teaches assigning each participant to a first account (§ 5-27, 43). Hele teaches storing data related to the plurality of participants to an account in a database comprising a data structure, said data structure comprising a customer entity class and an account entity class (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches wherein the customer entity class includes a plurality of customer entities that store data related to a participant (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches wherein the account entity class includes a plurality of account entries that store data related to the account (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches wherein at least one of the plurality of customer entries establishes a foreign key relationship with at least one of the plurality of account entities (§ 25-27, 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches wherein at least one of the plurality of account entities establishes a foreign key relationship with at least one of the plurality of customer entities (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches providing an account level underwriting decision at an account level based upon data related to a participant assigned to the first account (§ 27, 52, 81, 87). Hele teaches displaying data related to the account level underwriting decision (§ 27, 52, 81, 87). Hele does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants (§ 23). The use of having more than one participant in an life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to

Art Unit: 3694

company benefit plans. Hele teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. Hele does not specifically teach assigning an original participant to a second account. However, the University of Arizona teaches assigning at least one participant also to a second account (pg. 1-2). Hele teaches a life insurance account. The University of Arizona teaches supplemental accounts to insurance accounts. It would have been obvious to modify the techniques used in Hele to include the details of a second account being offered. Supplemental life insurance is extra coverage to supplement an actual policy. Sometimes the actual policy money may not be sufficient to meet all expenses. Thus supplemental life insurance gives extra financial security. Supplemental life insurance was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

9. Regarding claim 2, Hele teaches providing a participant level underwriting decision for each participant (¶ 5-27, 80-87). Hele does not specifically state a plurality

of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants assigned to an account (¶ 23). The use of having more than one participant in a life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Heise teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Heise the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

10. Regarding claim 3, Heise teaches establishing a plurality of insurance policies for a participant (¶ 5, 25, 46). Heise does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants assigned to an account (¶ 23). The use of having more than one participant in a life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Heise teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 3694

invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

11.

12. Regarding claim 4, Hele teaches providing account level underwriting decision at an account level comprises providing an account level underwriting decision based upon business rules for an account (abstract, ¶ 5, 15, 19, 25, 46, 81-86).

13. Regarding claim 5, Hele teaches providing account level underwriting decisions decision at an account level comprises providing at least one account level underwriting decision based upon all insurance policies of the account, wherein all insurance policies of the first account comprise the plurality of insurance policies for each participant (¶ 25, 46, 52, 80-87). Hele does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants assigned to an account (¶ 23). The use of having more than one participant in an life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Hele teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise

teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. Hele does not specifically teach assigning an original participant to a second account. However, the University of Arizona teaches assigning at least one participant also to a second account (pg. 1-2). Hele teaches a life insurance account. The University of Arizona teaches supplemental accounts to insurance accounts. It would have been obvious to modify the techniques used in Hele to include the details of a second account being offered. Supplemental life insurance is extra coverage to supplement an actual policy. Sometimes the actual policy money may not be sufficient to meet all expenses. Thus supplemental life insurance gives extra financial security. Supplemental life insurance was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

14. Regarding claim 6, Hele teaches managing an underwriting account for an insurance policy (§ 5). Hele teaches establishing a participant, wherein a customer assigned to an account represents a participant (§ 19-20, 25, 27, 43). Hele teaches

Art Unit: 3694

assigning each participant to a first account (§ 5-27, 43). Hele teaches storing data related to the participants the first account in a database comprising a data structure, and said data structure comprising a customer entity class and an account entity class (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches wherein the customer entity class includes a customer involvement entity class that comprises a plurality of customer involvement entities (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches wherein the account entity class includes an account involvement entity class that comprises a plurality of account involvement entities (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches wherein the at least one of the plurality of customer involvement entities establishes a foreign key relationship with at least one of the plurality of customer entities and at least one of the plurality of account entities (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches wherein the plurality of customer involvement entities store data related to the participants (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches wherein the plurality of account involvement entities store data related to the first account (§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele teaches establishing business rules at an account level (abstract, § 5, 15, 19, 46, 81-86). Hele teaches providing an underwriting decision for an account based upon the business rule (abstract, § 5, 15, 19, 27, 46, 52, 81-87). Hele teaches displaying the data related to the underwriting decision (§ 27, 52, 81, 87). Hele does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants (§ 23). The use of having more than one participant in an life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Hele teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the

design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. Hele does not specifically teach assigning an original participant to a second account. However, the University of Arizona teaches assigning at least one participant also to a second account (pg. 1-2). Hele teaches a life insurance account. The University of Arizona teaches supplemental accounts to insurance accounts. It would have been obvious to modify the techniques used in Hele to include the details of a second account being offered. Supplemental life insurance is extra coverage to supplement an actual policy. Sometimes the actual policy money may not be sufficient to meet all expenses. Thus supplemental life insurance gives extra financial security. Supplemental life insurance was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

15. Regarding claim 7, Hele teaches determining potential risk exposure of the first account at a participant level (§ 21, 25, 47-48, 61, 80, 94).

16. Regarding claim 8, Hele teaches wherein establishing a plurality of participants comprises establishing a participant comprising a plurality of business lines (§ 43, 55, 100). Hele does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants assigned to an account (§ 23). The use of having more than one participant in an life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Hele teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

17. Regarding claim 9, Hele teaches wherein establishing a plurality of participants comprises establishing at least one of the participants having insurance policies (§ 25, 46). Hele does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants assigned to an account (§ 23). The use of having more than one participant in an life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the

Art Unit: 3694

art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Hele teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. Hele does not specifically each participant having a plurality of insurance policies. However, the University of Arizona teaches a participant having a plurality of insurance policies (pg. 1-2). Hele teaches a life insurance account. The University of Arizona teaches supplemental accounts to insurance accounts. It would have been obvious to modify the techniques used in Hele to include the details of more than one account being offered. Supplemental life insurance is extra coverage to supplement an actual policy. Sometimes the actual policy money may not be sufficient to meet all expenses. Thus supplemental life insurance gives extra financial security. Supplemental life insurance was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

18. Regarding claim 10, Hele teaches wherein providing an underwriting decision for an account further comprises a step of providing an underwriting decision based upon the participants assigned to the first account (§§ 5-27, 46). Hele does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants assigned to an account (§§ 23). The use of having more than one participant in an life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Hele teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

19. Regarding claim 21, Hele teaches determining potential risk exposure of the first account based on a first potential risk exposure and a second potential risk exposure for a first business line and a second business line, respectively, wherein the at least one participant having an insurance policies has a plurality of business lines including the

Art Unit: 3694

first business line (§ 46-100). . Hele does not specifically each participant having a plurality of insurance policies. However, the University of Arizona teaches a participant having a plurality of insurance policies (pg. 1-2). Hele teaches a life insurance account. The University of Arizona teaches supplemental accounts to insurance accounts. It would have been obvious to modify the techniques used in Hele to include the details of more than one account being offered. Supplemental life insurance is extra coverage to supplement an actual policy. Sometimes the actual policy money may not be sufficient to meet all expenses. Thus supplemental life insurance gives extra financial security. Supplemental life insurance was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

20. Regarding claim 22, Hele teaches wherein the plurality of insurance policies of the one participant having insurance policies does not include a policy for the first business line (§ 46-100). Hele does not specifically each participant having a plurality of insurance policies. However, the University of Arizona teaches a participant having a plurality of insurance policies (pg. 1-2). Hele teaches a life insurance account. The University of Arizona teaches supplemental accounts to insurance accounts. It would have been obvious to modify the techniques used in Hele to include the details of more than one account being offered. Supplemental life insurance is extra coverage to supplement an actual policy. Sometimes the actual policy money may not be sufficient to meet all expenses. Thus supplemental life insurance gives extra financial security. Supplemental life insurance was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Art Unit: 3694

21. Regarding claim 25, Hele teaches wherein the foreign key relationships with at least one of the plurality of account entities and with at least one of the plurality of customer entities are used to retrieve data to provide an account level underwriting decision at an account level for the first account based upon data related to the participants assigned to the first account (§§ 42-46, 55, 59-60, 111, 146). Hele does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants (§§ 23). The use of having more than one participant in a life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Hele teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. Hele does not specifically teach assigning an original participant to a second account. However, the University of Arizona teaches assigning at least one participant also to a second account (pg. 1-2). Hele teaches a life insurance account. The University of Arizona teaches supplemental accounts to insurance accounts. It would have been

obvious to modify the techniques used in Hele to include the details of a second account being offered. Supplemental life insurance is extra coverage to supplement an actual policy. Sometimes the actual policy money may not be sufficient to meet all expenses. Thus supplemental life insurance gives extra financial security. Supplemental life insurance was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

22. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hele et al. (US 20020111835 A1) in view of University of Arizona (2001) in further view of Heise et al. (US 20030074229 A1) in further view of Perusse (1998).

23. Regarding claim 23, Hele teaches identifying at least one participant assigned to a first account. Hele does not specifically teach that the first participant was a former member of a second account (§ 46-100). However, Perusse teaches a former participant of an account, wherein the former participant is no longer assigned to the account, and wherein the former participant of the account comprises the second business line (pg. 1-4). Hele teaches insurance policies and changing coverage over time. Perusse teaches changing insurance companies. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hele to include the details of changing insurance policies. Changing insurance policies was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention. People change insurance policies do to coverage, marriage, birth, new homes, new job, and etc. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a former participant who changes insurance plans is not a

Art Unit: 3694

current participant. Hele does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants (§ 23). The use of having more than one participant in a life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Hele teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. Hele does not specifically teach a second account. However, the University of Arizona teaches assigning at least one participant also to a second account (pg. 1-2). Hele teaches a life insurance account. The University of Arizona teaches supplemental accounts to insurance accounts. It would have been obvious to modify the techniques used in Hele to include the details of a second account being offered. Supplemental life insurance is extra coverage to supplement an actual policy. Sometimes the actual policy money may not be sufficient to meet all expenses. Thus supplemental life insurance gives extra financial security. Supplemental life insurance was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

24. Regarding claim 24, Hele teaches wherein providing an underwriting decision for an account comprises providing an underwriting decision based upon the participants (§ 46-100). However, Perusse teaches a former participant of the first account who is no longer assigned to the first account (pg. 1-4). Hele teaches insurance policies and changing coverage over time. Perusse teaches changing insurance companies. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hele to include the details of changing insurance policies. Changing insurance policies was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention. People change insurance policies do to coverage, marriage, birth, new homes, new job, and etc. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a former participant who changes insurance plans is not a current participant. Hele does not specifically state a plurality of participants. However, Heise teaches a plurality of participants (§ 23). The use of having more than one participant in an life insurance underwriting account was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention especially in reference to company benefit plans. Hele teaches an overall process for underwriting insurance. Heise teaches the design, implementation, underwriting, and administration of benefit plans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the underwriting insurance system of Hele the ability to offer the underwriting to a plurality of participants as taught by Heise since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination of a process for underwriting insurance for an individual combined with the processes of underwriting insurance for a

more than one would have performed the same function as it did on its own because they involve the same content, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

25. Examiner's Note: The Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

26. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMIE H. SWARTZ whose telephone number is (571)272-7363. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/783,841
Art Unit: 3694

Page 21

/J. H. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 3694

/James P Trammell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3694